

**REMARKS**

Paragraph [0002] has been replaced to correct the translation. The word "deuteration" has been substituted for the word "dissolution".

Claims 1-8, 12-17, and 21-25 remain in the application. Claims 1, 12, and 21 are the remaining independent claims.

Claim 21 has been amended so that all claims have the limitation "a solvent-removing means for evaporating off of a first solvent from each sample and drying and solidifying the sample". Claims 1, 5, 12, 14, 21, and 22 have been amended to provide consistency.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 12-17, and 21-25 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102(b)) either by Ohashi et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,019,945 or Amano et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,835,707.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Neither reference teaches a solvent-removing means for evaporating off a first solvent from each sample and drying and solidifying the sample. For this reason, the rejection based on § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is urged this case is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By 

David C. Hanson, Reg. No. 23,024  
Attorney for Applicants  
700 Koppers Building  
436 Seventh Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1845  
Telephone: 412-471-8815  
Facsimile: 412-471-4094  
E-Mail: webblaw@webblaw.com